



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/775,527   | 02/09/2004  | Jeffrey L. Robbin    | 101-P271/P3060US1   | 1033             |
| 67521 7590 09/12/2008<br>TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION LAW GROUP, PC<br>ATTN: 101<br>19200 STEVENS CREEK BLVD., SUITE 240<br>CUPERTINO, CA 95014 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| POLLOCK, GREGORY A   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 3693   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 09/12/2008   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/775,527

**Applicant(s)**

ROBBIN, JEFFREY L.

**Examiner**

GREG POLLOCK

**Art Unit**

3693

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 25 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Claim objection to claim 11; 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

The examiner has review the applicant's "Amendment After Final" filed 08/25/2008. The examiner contends that the Final Rejection of record read on the claims as submitted 08/25/2008, with specific emphasis to the phrase "comprising" in the independent claims. The phrase "comprising" broadens the interpretation of the claims to encompass the priorities of a plurality of applications not just that of a client media player. The examiner recommends that future amendment to claims should consider replacement of "comprising" with "consisting of" with all appropriate method steps or components contained in their respective independent claims. It is further recommended that the independent claims contain (at minimum) the following method steps to more clearly define the invention: a client media player (which replaces occurrences of an "application") [support can be found in applicant disclosure ¶113]; method steps for user-modifiable prioritization of media tasks (make it clear that the task prioritization is a direct result of an action that is performed on the client media player by the user) [support can be found in applicant disclosure ¶131]; and a software component "consisting of" only coordination of the client media tasks for which the user is able to modify the priority [support can be found in applicant's disclosure ¶136, specifically Figure 5, element 506 where the task execution management is implemented as an application. Claiming the task execution management implemented as an operating system is not possible if the term "consisting of" is used since this would not allow operating system to accomplish anything but the method steps of the claimed invention.] . Current method steps and interconnection means should be more distinct to avoid multiple interpretations. Note also, that any amendments to claims should consider previously cited prior art with special attention to Greer et al. (Patent No. 5987466) which allows a user to defined priority levels within a Web browser environment.